arXiv:1107.5190v2 [math.PR] 18 Aug 2011

Functional ergodic limits of site-dependent branching Brownian motions in $\mathbb{R}$

Yuqiang Li *
School of Finance and Statistics, East China Normal University,
Shanghai 200241, P. R. China.

Abstract

In this paper, we studied the functional ergodic limits of the site-dependent branching Brownian motions in $\mathbb{R}$. The results show that the limiting processes are non-degenerate if and only if the variance functions of branching laws are integrable. When the functions are integrable, although the limiting processes will vary according to the integrals, they are always positive, infinitely divisible and self-similar, and their marginal distributions are determined by a kind of 1/2-fractional integral equations. As a byproduct, the unique non-negative solutions of the integral equations can be explicitly presented by the Lévy-measure of the corresponding limiting processes.

Keywords: Functional ergodic theorem; branching Brownian motion; site-dependence; Levy-Khintchine representation

AMS 2000 Subject Classification: 60F17; 60J80

1. Introduction

By the name "site-dependent branching Brownian motion" (SDBBM) we mean a branching particle system where particles start off at time $t = 0$ from a Poisson random field with Lebesgue intensity measure λ, move in $\mathbb{R}^d$ according to the Brownian motion, and evolve independently with critical branching laws at rate γ. Here the critical branching law of particles at site x is controlled by the generating function

$$g(s, x) = s + \sigma(x)(1 - s)^2, \qquad 0 \le s \le 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where $0 \le \sigma(x) \le 1/2$ is a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. (1.1) means that a particle at the site x reproduces 0-offspring with probability $\sigma(x)$, 1-offspring with probability $1 - 2\sigma(x)$ and 2-offsprings with probability $\sigma(x)$. This model generalizes the typical critical branching Brownian motion, which in fact corresponds to the case of $\sigma(x) \equiv 1/2$.

*Research supported partly by NSFC grant (10901054).

It is also a special case of the general branching particle systems discussed in Dynkin [6].

Let $N(s)$ denote the random counting measure of a SDBBM at time s, i.e. $N(s)(A)$ is the number of particles in the set A at time s, and be referred to as the SDBBM for convenience in this paper. Dynkin [6] had shown that for any non-negative $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of smooth rapidly decreasing functions,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\langle\phi, N(t)\rangle\Big\}\Big) = \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v(x,t)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $0 \le v(x,t) \le 1$ satisfies the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v - \gamma\sigma v^2, \tag{1.3}$$

with $v(x,0) = 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\phi(x)}$. Here Δ denotes the Laplace operator and $\langle f, \mu\rangle = \int f \mathrm{d}\mu$ for any integrable function f on the Borel measure μ. Imagine a SDBBM varied in the way that particles' life become more and more short and the density of initial distribution become more and more high. As a result, the so-called Dawson-Watanabe super-process, say Y, appears. According to Dynkin [6, Theorem 1.1], Y satisfies that for any meaningful initial measure-value μ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(\exp\{-\langle\phi, Y(t)\rangle\}) = \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v(x,t)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big\}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $0 \le v(x,t) \le 1$ is the solution of (1.3) with $v(x,0) = \phi(x)$. From Pinsky [15, Theorem 4 and Remark 5] we know that when $d \ge 2$, the invariant measure for Y depends on $\sigma(\cdot)$. However, when $d = 1$, the unique invariant measure is 0, the measure concentrated on the 0-measure, if and only if $\sigma(\cdot) \ne 0$ a.s. It is not surprising that these conclusions also hold for the SDBBMs.

Due to the close relation between the invariant measures and the ergodic limits, naturally, an interesting question arises. How the function σ affects the ergodic limits of the SDBBMs or the corresponding super-processes when $d = 1$? In this paper, we only discuss the SDBBMs. We believe the same discussions can be moved to the corresponding super-processes.

Let N be a SDBBM. Consider the measure-valued processes

$$X(t) = \int_0^t N(s)\mathrm{d}s, \quad t \ge 0, \tag{1.5}$$

which is generally referred to as the occupation time (process). Throughout this paper, we understand (1.5) as

$$\langle X(t), \phi\rangle = \int_0^t \langle N(s), \phi\rangle \mathrm{d}s, \quad t \ge 0,$$

for any $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The so-called ergodic limits of the SDBBMs are, in general, referred to the limits of $X(T)/T$ as $T \to \infty$.

This study on typical critical branching Brownian motions can be originated to the 70s of the last century. Sawyer and Fleischman [17] proved that when $d = 1$

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} X(T)(A) < \infty, \qquad a.s.,$$

which immediately leads to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{X(t)(A)}{t} = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

almost surely. Iscoe [7] showed that the corresponding super-Brownian motions have the same property when $d = 1$. Moreover, Cox and Geriffeath [4] found that the same picture arises in voter models.

To step forward, our interests in this paper are to study the functional ergodic limits of SDBBMs. More precisely, we study the functional limit of $X_T = \{X_T(t), t \geq 0\}$ in $C([0, 1], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$, where

$$X_T(t) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^{Tt} N(s)\mathrm{d}s, \tag{1.7}$$

and $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is the dual space of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Our results show that the limiting process is non-degenerate if and only if the variance function is integrable. If $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty$, then (1.6) holds in probability, and hence, X_T converges in finite-dimensional distributions to the measure concentrated on the 0-measure. This result extends the aforementioned result on the typical branching Brownian motions in $\mathbb{R}$ and corresponding super-processes. If $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$, then (1.6) is not true. In fact, we prove that the limiting process will vary according to the integral of $\sigma(x)$. But it is always positive, infinitely divisible and self-similar and its marginal distributions are determined by a kind of 1/2-fractional integral equations. These results are similar in appearance to but different in essence from those in literature (see, for example, [4, 8, 16]) on the typical branching Brownian motions in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and corresponding super-processes.

The methods of this paper consist of two key-points. One is the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions of X_T under the condition of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$. To solve this problem, we need study the convergence of the solutions of some nonlinear integral equations by means of the Gronwall's inequality. Though this idea is similar to those used in Iscoe [7, 8] and Talarczyk [16], some nontrivial modifications are needed to handle the new technical complexities caused by the site-dependence. The other is to analyze solutions of the 1/2-fractional integral equations. Based on these analytical results we find the limiting processes are degenerate under the condition of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty$. Furthermore, by using the Levy-Khintchine representation, we show the positivity of the limiting process under the condition of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$ and get the explicit expressions of the solutions of the integral equations. This trick differs from that used by Iscoe [8].

There is much literature on occupation times of branching particle systems and the closely related super-processes; see, for example, Dawson *et al* [5] and the references

therein. Studying the functional limits of occupation times of typical (d, α, β)-branching particle systems was triggered by Bojdecki *et al* [1] and was developed and generalized by, for example, Bojdecki *et al* [2], Li [9], Li and Xiao [12] and Miloś [13]. Li [10, 11] introduced a kind of site-dependent branching particle systems which are same as the SDBBMs except that the particles move according to the $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_d)$-stable Lévy motion whose i-th component, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, d$, is an α_i-stable Levy process and independent of other components. Under the assumption that $0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$, the author has studied the functional theorems of central limit type of the occupation times except the case of $\sum_{i=1}^{d} 1/\alpha_i = 1/2$ and obtained some interesting results which differ from the existing results of the typical (d, α, β)-branching systems and the particle systems without branching. Observe that the SDBBM in R is in essence the site-dependent branching particle system in the case of $\sum_{i=1}^{d} 1/\alpha_i = 1/2$. This paper also completes the picture of research in this direction.

Without other statement, in this paper, we use M to denote an unspecified positive finite constant which may not necessarily be the same in each occurrence.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we report the main results. Section 3 devotes to studying the finite-dimensional distribution of X_T and other related lemmas. Sections 4 and 5 include the proofs of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3, respectively. In the last section, i.e. Section 6, the limiting process ξ is discussed.

2. Main results

Consider a SDBBM $N = \{N(s)\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $B = \{B(s)\}$ denote the corresponding Brownian motion. $\{L_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ denotes the semi-group of Brownian motion. Then

$$L_s f(x) := \mathbb{E}(f(\xi(t+s))|\xi(t) = x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} \exp\Big\{ -\frac{(y-x)^2}{2s} \Big\} f(y)\mathrm{d}y, \quad (2.1)$$

for all $s, t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and bounded measurable functions f. To avoid misunderstanding, we sometimes write $L_s f(x)$ as $L_s(f(\cdot))(x)$. Let

$$p_s(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} \exp\Big\{ -\frac{x^2}{2s} \Big\},$$

for all $s > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Recall that

$$p_{rt}(x) = r^{-1/2} p_t(r^{-1/2}x). \quad (2.2)$$

Therefore,

$$L_{rt} f(r^{1/2}x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} r^{-1/2} p_t(x - r^{-1/2}y) f(y)\mathrm{d}y, \quad (2.3)$$

for all $r > 0$. Now we define the rescaled occupation time process $X_T = \{X_T(t), t \geq 0\}$ as (1.7). The main results of this paper read as follows.

Theorem 2.1 *If $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty$, then X_T converges to 0 in finite-dimensional distributions as $T \to \infty$.*

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose $K = \gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$. Then as $T \to \infty$, the rescaled occupation time process $\{X_T(t), , 0 \le t \le 1\}$ converges weakly in $C([0,1], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$ to a process $X = \lambda\xi$ where $\xi = \{\xi(t)\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a non-negative process whose Laplace transforms of finite-dimensional distributions*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{ -\sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta_k \xi(t_k)\Big\}\Big) = \exp\Big\{ K \int_{1-t_n}^{1} \Lambda^2(s)\mathrm{d}s - \sum_{k=1}^{n} t_k\theta_k \Big\}, \tag{2.4}$$

for any given non-negative constants $\theta_1, \theta_2, \cdots, \theta_n$ and $0 \le t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n \le 1$, where $\Lambda(s)$ is the unique nonnegative solution of the equation

$$y(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta_k \int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}\mathrm{d}u - K\int_0^s \frac{y^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}, \quad s \in [0,1]. \tag{2.5}$$

From Theorem 2.2, it is easy to see that

Proposition 2.1 *The process ξ is infinitely divisible, self-similar with index 1, non-decreasing and nonnegative, and has continuous paths.*

To get more information about ξ, we need to make more careful study on the solution of (2.5). For any given $\theta > 0$, let $\Lambda(s,\theta)$, $0 \le s \le 1$, be the unique non-negative solution of the equation

$$y(s) = \sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}\theta - K\int_0^s \frac{y^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}, \tag{2.6}$$

which is the special case of (2.5) with $k = 1$, $\theta_1 = \theta$ and $t_1 = 1$. We obtain the following results.

Theorem 2.3 (1) *$\Lambda(s,\theta)$ is continuous, differentiable and non-decreasing on $s \in [0,1]$. Moreover, $\Lambda(s,\theta) \le \sqrt{\theta/K}$.*

(2) *$\Lambda(s,\theta)$ can be continuously extended to the unique non-decreasing and non-negative solution of (2.6) for all $s \ge 0$. Denote the extension by $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ as well. Then*

$$\Lambda(s,\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\Lambda(1,\theta s) \tag{2.7}$$

and $\lim_{s\to\infty} \Lambda(s,1) = 1/\sqrt{K}$.

Proposition 2.2 *There exists a measure ν on $(0,\infty)$ with $\nu((0,\infty)) = \infty$ and*

$$\int_0^\infty x\nu(\mathrm{d}x) = 1, \qquad \int_0^\infty x^2\nu(\mathrm{d}x) = 2K/\pi,$$

such that for any $\theta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta\xi(t)}\big) = \exp\Big\{ -\int_0^\infty (1-\mathrm{e}^{-t\theta x})\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big\}. \tag{2.8}$$

Furthermore, for any $s \geq 0$ and $\theta > 0$,

$$K\Lambda^2(s,\theta) = \theta - \int_0^\infty \theta \mathrm{e}^{-\theta s x} \nu(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\Lambda(s,\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} \int_0^\infty Q(\theta s x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$Q(x) = \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\mathrm{e}^x} \int_0^x \frac{\mathrm{e}^y}{\sqrt{y}} \mathrm{d}y, \ \ x > 0.$$

From Proposition 2.2 we immediately get that

Corollary 2.1 *For any $t > 0$, $\xi(t)$ is non-trivial and positive.*

At the end of this section, let us make some remarks on the results mentioned above.

Remark 2.1 (1) Cox and Geriffeath [4] proved for the typical critical branching Brownian motions by a method of cumulants that when the spatial dimension $d = 2$,

$$\frac{X_T(1)(A)}{T\lambda(A)} \to \varsigma, \quad \text{in law}, \tag{2.11}$$

where ς is a nontrivial infinitely divisible random variable with moments of all order. Via Laplace transforms of measure-valued random variables and nonlinear partial differential equations, Iscoe [8] proved the same result for the corresponding super-Brownian motions and further pointed out the positivity of ς in (2.11). When $t = 1$ is fixed, Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.2 reveal the similar results. However, the methods used in this paper to prove the positivity are different from those used in Iscoe [8].

(2) The similar functional ergodic theorems of the typical branching Brownian motion and the related super-Brownian motions were reported by Talarczyk [16] and Iscoe [8], respectively, in the case of the spatial dimension $d = 2$. Compared with those results, our result is essentially different in the Laplace functions of the limit processes. In fact, using the Riemann-Liouville type 1/2-fractional integral operator,

$$J^{1/2}(f)(s) := \int_0^s \frac{f(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}},$$

the equation (2.5) can be rewritten as

$$\Lambda(s) + KJ^{1/2}\Lambda^2(s) = \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k \int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-s+u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \mathrm{d}u = J^{1/2}h(s),$$

where

$$h(s) = \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-s).$$

This equation can not be inferred from the corresponding results in Talarczyk [16] and Iscoe [8]. In addition, (2.9) and (2.10) show the one-on-one corresponding relations between the non-negative solution of (2.6) and the Lévy measure of ξ.

(3) By some basic renewal discussion, it is easy to obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}(\langle N(s), \phi\rangle) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s\phi(x)\mathrm{d}x = \langle \lambda, \phi\rangle. \tag{2.12}$$

To assure non-degenerate limits existing, the rescaled occupation time fluctuation processes should be defined as follows.

$$\langle Y_T(t), \phi\rangle = \frac{1}{F_T}\int_0^{Tt} \langle N(s) - \lambda, \phi\rangle, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$F_T = \begin{cases} T, & 0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty; \\ T^{3/4}, & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x = 0. \end{cases}$$

For the rescaled occupation time fluctuations, we have the following functional limits.

(i) When $0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(y)\mathrm{d}y < \infty$, the rescaled occupation time fluctuation process $\{Y_T(t),, 0 \le t \le 1\}$ converges weakly in $C([0,1], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$ to the process $Y = \lambda\eta$ where $\eta(t) = \xi(t) - t$ and ξ is the process in Theorem 2.2.

(ii) When $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(y)\mathrm{d}y = 0$, i.e. $\phi(y) = 0$ a.e., the rescaled occupation time fluctuation process $\{Y_T(t),, 0 \le t \le 1\}$ converges weakly in $C([0,1], \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$ to the process $Y = k\lambda\eta$ where $\eta = \{\eta(t)\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is the fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index $\frac{3}{4}$ and k is a constant.

The part (i) is an immediate result from Theorem 2.2, and the part (ii) was essentially investigated in Bojdecki *et al* [1].

3. Finite-dimensional distributions of X_T

Define a sequence of random variables $\tilde{X}_T$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ as follows: For any $n \ge 0$, let

$$\langle \tilde{X}_T, \psi\rangle =: \int_0^1 \langle X_T(t), \psi(\cdot, t)\rangle \mathrm{d}t = \int_0^T \langle N(s), \psi_T(\cdot, s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and

$$\psi_T(x,s) = \frac{1}{T}\int_{s/T}^1 \psi(x,t)\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \text{for } s \in [0,T]. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.1 *For any nonnegative $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{ -\langle \tilde{X}_T, \psi\rangle\Big\}\Big) = \exp\Big\{ -\int_{\mathbb{R}} V_{\psi_T}(x,T,0)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\psi_T(x,s)$ is defined by (3.2) and $V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)$ is a continuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}\times\{(t,r): t\geq 0, r\geq 0, t+r\leq T\}$ and satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) = &\int_0^t L_s\Big(\psi_T(\cdot, r+s)\big(1-V_{\psi_T}(\cdot,t-s,r+s)\big)\Big)(x)\mathrm{d}s \\ &-\gamma\int_0^t L_s\Big(\sigma(\cdot)V^2_{\psi_T}(\cdot,t-s,r+s)\Big)(x)\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. On $\mathbb{R}\times\{(t,r): t\geq 0, r\geq 0, t+r\leq T\}$, define

$$H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) := \mathbb{E}_x\Big(\exp\big\{ -\int_0^t \big\langle N(s), \psi_T(\cdot, r+s)\big\rangle \mathrm{d}s\big\}\Big). \tag{3.5}$$

Since N_0 is a Poisson random measure with Lebesgue intensity measure, from (3.1), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathrm{e}^{-\langle \tilde{X}_T,\psi\rangle}\Big) = \exp\Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big[H_{\psi_T}(x,T,0)-1\big]\mathrm{d}x\Big\}. \tag{3.6}$$

By renewal arguments, (3.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) = &\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma t}\mathbb{E}_x\Big\{ \exp\Big(-\int_0^t \psi_T(\xi(s), r+s)\mathrm{d}s\Big)\Big\} \\ &+\int_0^t \gamma \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma s}\mathbb{E}_x\Big\{ \exp\Big(-\int_0^s \psi_T(\xi(u), r+u)\mathrm{d}u\Big) \\ &\times\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\xi(s)}\exp\Big(-\int_0^{t-s}\big\langle N(u), \psi_T(\cdot, r+s+u)\big\rangle\mathrm{d}u\Big)\Big]^{k(\xi(s))}\Big\}\mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $k(\xi(s))$ denotes the number of particles generated at the first splitting time. Note that the process $k(x)$ is independent of the Brownian motion ξ and for any $0<z<1$

$$\mathbb{E}(z^{k(x)}) = g(z,x) = z+\sigma(x)(1-z)^2. \tag{3.8}$$

(3.7) yields that

$$H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) = \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma t} I_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) + \int_0^t \gamma \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(t-s)} K_{\psi_T}(x,t-s,r,s)\mathrm{d}s, \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\psi_T}(x,t,r) &= \mathbb{E}_x \exp\Big(-\int_0^t \psi_T(\xi(s), r+s)\mathrm{d}s\Big), \\ K_{\psi_T}(x,t,r,s) &= \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\exp\Big(-\int_0^t \psi_T(\xi(u), r+u)\mathrm{d}u\Big) g\big(H_{\psi_T}(\xi(t), s, r+t), \xi(t)\big)\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x,t,r)\in\mathbb{R}\times\{(t,r):t\geq 0,r\geq 0,t+r\leq T\}$. By the Feynman-Kac formula,

$$\frac{\partial I_{\psi_T}}{\partial t}=\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\psi_T(x,r)\Big)I_{\psi_T},$$
$$\frac{\partial K_{\psi_T}}{\partial t}=\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\psi_T(x,r)\Big)K_{\psi_T}.$$

Therefore, (3.9) indicates that

$$\frac{\partial H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)}{\partial t}=\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\psi_T(x,r)\Big)H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)+\gamma\mathbb{E}_x\Big[g\big(H_{\psi_T}(\xi(0),t,r),x\big)\Big],$$

which plus (3.8) leads to that

$$\frac{\partial H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)}{\partial t}=\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\psi_T(x,r)\Big)H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)+\gamma\sigma(x)(1-H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r))^2. \quad (3.10)$$

Let

$$V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)=1-H_{\psi_T}(x,t,r). \quad (3.11)$$

Then it is easy to see that $V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}\times\{(t,r):t\geq 0,r\geq 0,t+r\leq T\}$. Furthermore, from (3.10) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)}{\partial t}=&\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)-\gamma\sigma(x)V^2_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)\\&+\psi_T(x,r)\big(1-V_{\psi_T}(x,t,r)\big),\end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

which implies (3.4). Moreover, from (3.6) and (3.11), (3.3) follows. □

Since X_T is a $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$-valued process, as is well-known, the finite dimensional distributions of X_T is determined by the family of Laplace functions, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\langle X_T(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\big\}\Big),$$

for any given nonnegative $\phi_1,\phi_2,\cdots,\phi_n\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, $0<t_1<t_2<\cdots<t_n\leq 1$ and $n\geq 1$.

Lemma 3.2 *For $0\leq t_1<t_2<\cdots<t_n\leq 1$, nonnegative $\phi_1,\phi_2,\cdots,\phi_n\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, and $T>0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\langle X_T(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\Big\}\Big)=\exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}}V_{\psi_T}(x,T,0)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}, \quad (3.13)$$

where $0\leq V_{\psi_T}(x,T,0)\leq 1$ satisfies the equation (3.4) with

$$\psi_T(x,t)=\frac{1}{T}\psi(x,\frac{t}{T}),\qquad \psi(x,t)=\sum_{k=1}^n\phi_k(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(t). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof There exists $\psi_{T,m}$ of the form (3.2) such that for any (x,t), $\psi_{T,m}(x,t)$ converges to $\psi_T(x,t)$ in the monotone decreasing way as $m\to\infty$. Lemma 3.2 follows from Lemma 3.1. The details are same as those lead to Lemma 2.5 in [16] and omitted. □

Remark 3.1 Let $v(x,t) = V_{\psi_T}(x,t,T-t)$. Lemma 3.2 and (3.12) imply that $v(x,t)$ satisfies that

$$\frac{\partial v(x,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v(x,t) - \gamma\sigma(x)v^2(x,t) + \frac{1}{T}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\phi_k(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(\frac{T-t}{T})\big(1-v(x,t)\big),$$

with $v(x,0)=0$, and that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^{n}\langle X_T(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\Big\}\Big) = \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}}v(x,T)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}.$$

4. Weak convergence of X_T when $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x<\infty$.

The aim of this section is to prove the weak convergence of the rescaled occupation time X_T. Note that the weak convergence follows from the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions plus tightness.

Theorem 4.1 *As $T\to\infty$, the occupation time process $\{X_T(t),,0\le t\le 1\}$ converges in finite-dimensional distributions to a $\mathcal{S}'(R)$-valued process $X=\lambda\xi$ where $\xi=\{\xi(t)\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a non-negative process whose Laplace transforms of finite-dimensional distributions are as follows.*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^{n}\theta_k\xi(t_k)\Big\}\Big) = \exp\Big\{K\int_0^1\Lambda^2(s)\mathrm{d}s - \sum_{k=1}^{n}t_k\theta_k\Big\}, \tag{4.1}$$

for any given non-negative constants $\theta_1,\theta_2,\cdots,\theta_n$ and $0\le t_1<t_2<\cdots<t_n\le 1$, where $\Lambda(s)$ is the unique nonnegative solution of the equation (2.5).

To prove this result, we need some auxiliary lemmas. For this end, we first remark that, throughout this section, we always assume that $\phi_1,\phi_2,\cdots,\phi_n\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ are arbitrary non-negative functions, $0\le t_1<t_2<\cdots<t_n\le 1$, and $\psi(x,t)$, $\psi_T(x,t)$ have the forms in (3.14) and $K=\gamma\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x<\infty$. Define

$$\bar{H}_T(x,s) := T^{1/2}V_{\psi_T}(x,Ts,T(1-s)). \tag{4.2}$$

Observing (3.4), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{H}_T(x,s) =& T^{1/2}\int_0^{Ts}L_u\Big(\psi_T(\cdot,T(1-s)+u)\big(1-V_{\psi_T}(\cdot,Ts-u,T(1-s)+u)\big)\Big)(x)\mathrm{d}u\\
&-\gamma T^{1/2}\int_0^{Ts}L_u\Big(\sigma(\cdot)V^2_{\psi_T}(\cdot,Ts-u,T(1-s)+u)\Big)(x)\mathrm{d}u\\
=& T^{3/2}\int_0^s L_{Tu}\psi_T(x,T(1-s+u))\mathrm{d}u - \gamma T^{1/2}\int_0^s L_{Tu}(\sigma(\cdot)\bar{H}^2_T(\cdot,s-u))(x)\mathrm{d}u\\
&-\int_0^s TL_{Tu}(\psi_T(\cdot,T(1-s+u))\bar{H}_T(\cdot,s-u))(x)\mathrm{d}u.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.14) into the above formula, we further have that

$$\bar{H}_T(x,s) = I_1(T,x,s) - I_2(T,x,s) - I_3(T,x,s), \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(T,x,s) &= T^{1/2}\int_0^s L_{Tu}\psi(x,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}u \\ &= \int_0^s \mathrm{d}u \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}} \psi(y,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}y; \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

$$I_2(T,x,s) = \int_0^s L_{Tu}(\psi(\cdot,1-s+u)\bar{H}_T(\cdot,s-u))(x)\mathrm{d}u; \tag{4.5}$$

$$I_3(T,x,s) = \gamma T^{1/2}\int_0^s L_{Tu}(\sigma(\cdot)\bar{H}_T^2(\cdot,s-u))(x)\mathrm{d}u. \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.1 *There exists a constant M such that for any $T>0$ and $(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]$,*

$$\bar{H}_T(x,s)\le M.$$

Proof. From (2.12), (3.11) and (3.14) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_T(x,s) &= T^{1/2}V_{\psi_T}(x,Ts,T(1-s)) \\ &\le T^{1/2}\int_0^{Ts} L_u\psi_T(x,T(1-s)+u)\mathrm{d}u \\ &= T^{1/2}\int_0^s L_{Tu}\psi(x,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

By using (2.1), we further have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_T(x,s) &\le T^{1/2}\int_0^s \mathrm{d}u\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi Tu}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}} \psi(y,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}y \\ &\le \int_0^s \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(y,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\psi=\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(t)$ and $\phi_k\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. There exists a positive constant M, such that for any $T>0$ and $(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]$,

$$\bar{H}_T(x,s)\le M\int_0^s \frac{1}{2\sqrt{u}}\mathrm{d}u = M\sqrt{s}\le M. \tag{4.7}$$

Lemma 4.2 *For any $(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]$, as $T\to\infty$*

$$I_1(T,x,s)\to\sum_{k=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}\mathrm{d}u. \tag{4.8}$$

Proof From (4.4), it is easy to see that for all $T>0$ and $(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]$,

$$I_1(T,x,s)=\sum_{k=1}^n\int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-s+u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y.$$

Letting $T\to\infty$, by the dominated convergence theorem, we can readily get (4.8). □

Lemma 4.3 *For all $T>0$ and $(x,s)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]$, there exists a constant $M>0$ such that as $T\to\infty$,*

$$M\sum_{k=1}^{n}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi Tu}}\geq I_2(T,x,s)\to 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof From (4.5) and (4.7) we obtain that

$$I_2(T,x,s)\leq M\int_0^s L_{Tu}\psi(x,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}u,$$

which and (2.1) further imply that

$$I_2(T,x,s)\leq M\int_0^s\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi Tu}}\mathrm{d}u\int_{\mathbb{R}}\psi(y,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}y.$$

Now substituting (3.14) into the above formula immediately leads to (4.9). □

Lemma 4.4 *There exists a bounded and measurable function $G(s)$ such that for any $s\in[0,1]$, as $T\to\infty$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\bar{H}_T^2(x,s)\mathrm{d}x\to G(s). \tag{4.10}$$

Proof To simplify the notation, let

$$G_T(x,s)=\sigma(x)\bar{H}_T^2(x,s). \tag{4.11}$$

For any given $s\in[0,1]$, define the distance between $G_{T_1}(x,s)$ and $G_{T_2}(x,s)$ for any $0<T_1<T_2$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}d_G(T_1,T_2;s)&=\int_{\mathbb{R}}|G_{T_1}(x,s)-G_{T_2}(x,s)|\mathrm{d}x\\&=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\Big|\bar{H}_{T_1}(x,s)-\bar{H}_{T_2}(x,s)\Big|\Big|\bar{H}_{T_1}(x,s)+\bar{H}_{T_2}(x,s)\Big|\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

By using (4.7), we know that

$$d_G(T_1,T_2;s)\leq M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\Big|\bar{H}_{T_1}(x,s)-\bar{H}_{T_2}(x,s)\Big|\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.12}$$

Substituting (4.3) into the right hand side of (4.12), we further obtain that

$$d_G(T_1,T_2;s)\leq\bar{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s)+M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\Big|I_3(T_1,x,s)-I_3(T_2,x,s)\Big|\mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$\bar{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s)=M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\sum_{i=1}^{2}\Big|I_i(T_1,x,s)-I_i(T_2,x,s)\Big|\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.14}$$

Furthermore, from (4.6) and (4.11) it follows that

$$M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\Big|I_3(T_1,x,s)-I_3(T_2,x,s)\Big|\mathrm{d}x\leq\tilde{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s)+\hat{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s) &= M\gamma\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\Big|T_1^{1/2}L_{T_1u}G_{T_2}(x,s-u)-T_2^{1/2}L_{T_2u}G_{T_2}(x,s-u)\Big|\mathrm{d}u\\ &= M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_2u}}G_{T_2}(y,s-u)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\qquad -\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_1u}}G_{T_2}(y,s-u)\mathrm{d}y\Big|\mathrm{d}u\\ &= M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_2u}}-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_1u}}\Big)G_{T_2}(y,s-u)\mathrm{d}y, \quad (4.15)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s) &= M\gamma T_1^{1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s L_{T_1u}\Big|G_{T_1}(\cdot,s-u)-G_{T_2}(\cdot,s-u)\Big|(x)\mathrm{d}u\\ &\le M\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big|G_{T_1}(y,s-u)-G_{T_2}(y,s-u)\Big|\mathrm{d}y\\ &\le M\int_0^s\frac{d_G(T_1,T_2;u)}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}\mathrm{d}u. \quad (4.16)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, substituting (4.11) and (4.7) into (4.15) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s) &\le M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_1u}}\Big)\sigma(y)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\le M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^1\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2T_1u}}\Big)\sigma(y)\mathrm{d}y=:\delta_1(T_1), \quad (4.17)\end{aligned}$$

for any $T_2>T_1$ and $s\in[0,1]$. It is easy to see that as $T_1\to\infty$,

$$\delta_1(T_1)\to 0. \quad (4.18)$$

On the other hand, applying (4.4) and (4.9) to (4.14), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s) &\le M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}[\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2T_2u}}-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2T_1u}}]\psi(y,1-s+u)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\quad +M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)(I_2(T_1,x,s)+I_2(T_2,x,s))\mathrm{d}x\\ &\le M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u\sum_{k=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}}[1-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2T_1u}}]\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\quad +M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi T_1u}}\sum_{k=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ_k, $k=1,2,\cdots,n$, all are in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a constant $M>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\rho}_G(T_1,T_2;s) &\le M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u\int_{\mathbb{R}}[1-\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2T_1u}}]\phi(y)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\quad +M\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(y)\mathrm{d}y\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T_1u}}\mathrm{d}u\\ &=:\delta_2(T_1)\to 0, \quad (4.19)\end{aligned}$$

as $T_1 \to \infty$. Let

$$\delta(T_1) = \delta_1(T_1) + \delta_2(T_1). \tag{4.20}$$

From (4.13),(4.14),(4.16),(4.17), (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain that

$$d_G(T_1, T_2; s) \leq \delta(T_1) + M \int_0^s \frac{d_G(T_1, T_2; u)}{\sqrt{s-u}} \mathrm{d}u, \tag{4.21}$$

for every $s \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, (4.21) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d_G(T_1, T_2; s) &\leq \delta(T_1) + M \int_0^s \frac{\delta(T_1)}{\sqrt{s-u}} \mathrm{d}u + M \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{s-u}} \int_0^u \frac{d_G(T_1, T_2; r)}{\sqrt{u-r}} \mathrm{d}r \\ &\leq \delta(T_1) M + M \int_0^s d_G(T_1, T_2; r) \mathrm{d}r \int_r^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{(u-r)(s-u)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Observe that

$$\int_r^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{(u-r)(s-u)}} = \int_0^1 \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{\sqrt{y-y^2}} = \pi. \tag{4.23}$$

(4.22) yields that

$$d_G(T_1, T_2; s) \leq \delta(T_1) M + M \int_0^s d_G(T_1, T_2; r) \mathrm{d}r, \tag{4.24}$$

which and the Gronwall's inequality implies that

$$d_G(T_1, T_2; s) \leq M \delta(T_1) \mathrm{e}^{Ms}, \tag{4.25}$$

for every $s \in [0, 1]$. Since (4.18), (4.19) and (4.20) imply that

$$\delta(T_1) \to 0,$$

as $T_1 \to \infty$, (4.25) indicates that for every $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$d_G(T_1, T_2; s) \to 0, \tag{4.26}$$

for any $T_2 > T_1$ and $T_1 \to \infty$. From (4.26) we derive that for every $s \in [0, 1]$, $\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_T(x, s) \mathrm{d}x\}_T$ is a cauchy sequence. Therefore, for every $s \in [0, 1]$ there exists a function $G(s)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_T(x, s) \mathrm{d}x \to G(s), \tag{4.27}$$

as $T \to \infty$. Note for any fixed T, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_T(x, s) \mathrm{d}x$ is non-negative and measurable on $s \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, (4.7) and the integrability of $\sigma(x)$ imply that for all $T > 0$ $\int_{\mathbb{R}} G_T(x, s) \mathrm{d}x$ is bounded. Therefore $G(s)$ is measurable and bounded as well. □

Lemma 4.5 *There exists a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$M \geq I_3(T, x, s), \tag{4.28}$$

for all $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$, and as $T \to \infty$

$$I_3(T, x, s) \to \gamma \int_0^s \frac{G(s-u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}, \tag{4.29}$$

for all $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$.

Proof From (4.6) it follows that

$$I_3(T, x, s) = \gamma \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}} \sigma(y) \bar{H}_T^2(y, s-u))\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.30}$$

(4.7) and the integrability of $\sigma(x)$ yield that there is a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$I_3(T, x, s) \leq M \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \leq M, \tag{4.31}$$

for all $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$. In addition, (4.30) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(T, x, s) = & \gamma \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(y) \bar{H}_T^2(y, s-u)\mathrm{d}y \\ & -\gamma \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}}) \sigma(y) \bar{H}_T^2(y, s-u)\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

By using Lemma 4.4, it is easy to see that as $T \to \infty$,

$$\gamma \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(y) \bar{H}_T^2(y, s-u)\mathrm{d}y \to \gamma \int_0^s \frac{G(s-u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}, \tag{4.33}$$

for all $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$. Furthermore, by using (4.7), for all $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}}) \sigma(y) \bar{H}_T^2(y, s-u)\mathrm{d}y \\ & \quad \leq M \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2Tu}}) \sigma(y)\mathrm{d}y \to 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

as $T \to \infty$. Applying (4.33) and (4.34) to (4.32), we arrive at (4.29). □

Lemma 4.6 *For any $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$, as $T \to \infty$,*

$$\bar{H}_T(x, s) \to \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}\mathrm{d}u \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y - \gamma \int_0^s \frac{G(s-u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}. \tag{4.35}$$

Let $\Lambda(s)$ $(0 \leq s \leq 1)$ denote the right hand side of (4.35). Then $\Lambda(s)$ is the unique non-negative solution of the equation

$$y(s) = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^s \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_k]}(1-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}\mathrm{d}u \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y - K \int_0^s \frac{y^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}. \tag{4.36}$$

Proof (4.35) is an immediate conclusion from (4.3) and Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5. $\Lambda(s)$ is non-negative and bounded because $\bar{H}_T(x,s)$ is non-negative and $0 \le \bar{H}_T(x,s) \le M$ for all $(x,s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0,1]$ and $T > 0$. To show $\Lambda(s)$ is a solution of (4.36), we apply (4.35) and the dominated convergence theorem to (4.10), and then get that

$$G(s) = \Lambda^2(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(y) \mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.37}$$

Substituting (4.37) into (4.35), we have that $\Lambda(s)$ satisfies the equation (4.36). To prove the uniqueness, we suppose there is another non-negative solution $\Theta(s)$ of (4.36). Let

$$r(s) := |\Lambda(s) - \Theta(s)|, \qquad s \in [0,1].$$

Note that the non-negative solution of (4.36) should be bounded. There exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$|\Lambda^2(s) - \Theta^2(s)| \le M r(s).$$

Therefore, from (4.36) we get that

$$r(s) \le M \int_0^s \frac{r(s-u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{u}}.$$

Then

$$r(s) \le M \int_0^s \frac{r(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{s-u}} \le M \int_0^s r(t)\mathrm{d}t \int_t^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{(s-u)(u-t)}},$$

which and (4.23) yield that

$$r(s) \le \pi M \int_0^s r(t)\mathrm{d}t. \tag{4.38}$$

By the Gronwall's inequality, $r(s) \equiv 0$, and hence, $\Lambda(s) = \Theta(s)$ for all $s \in [0,1]$. □

Remark 4.1 From (4.36), it is easy to see that $\Lambda(s) = 0$ for all $s \in [0, 1 - t_n)$.

Now we define

$$H_T(x) := T^{1/2} V_{\psi_T}(T^{1/2}x, T, 0), \tag{4.39}$$

From (3.4) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} H_T(x) = {} & T^{1/2} \int_0^1 T L_{Ts}\Big(\psi_T(\cdot, Ts)\big(1 - V_{\psi_T}(\cdot, T(1-s), Ts)\big)\Big)(T^{1/2}x)\mathrm{d}s \\ & -\gamma T^{1/2} \int_0^1 T L_{Ts}\Big(\sigma(\cdot) V^2_{\psi_T}(\cdot, T(1-s), Ts)\Big)(T^{1/2}x)\mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned}$$

which combining with (2.3) further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} H_T(x) = {} & T \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi_T(y, Ts)\mathrm{d}y \\ & -T \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi_T(y, Ts) V_{\psi_T}(y, T(1-s), Ts)\mathrm{d}y \\ & -\gamma \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s T \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\sigma(y) V^2_{\psi_T}(y, T(1-s), Ts)\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

Applying (3.14) to (4.40) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} H_T(x) = &\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\mathrm{d}y \\ &-T^{-1/2}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\mathrm{d}y \\ &-\gamma\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\sigma(y)\big(\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\big)^2\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

Lemma 4.7 *Suppose $K = \gamma\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, as $T \to \infty$,*

$$H_T(x) \to \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{t_k} p_s(x)\mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y - K\int_0^1 p_s(x)\Lambda^2(1-s)\mathrm{d}s. \tag{4.42}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_T(x)\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{k=1}^n t_k\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y - K\int_0^1 \Lambda^2(s)\mathrm{d}s. \tag{4.43}$$

Proof By the dominated convergence theorem, it is easy to see that as $T \to \infty$,

$$\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\mathrm{d}y \to \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{t_k} p_s(x)\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y, \tag{4.44}$$

for all $x \in R$. In addition, by (4.3) and the dominated convergence theorem again, we can readily get that as $T \to \infty$,

$$T^{-1/2}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\bar{H}_{\psi_T}(y,1-s)\mathrm{d}y \to 0, \tag{4.45}$$

for all $x \in R$. Furthermore, by using Lemma 4.6, (4.7) and the dominated convergence theorem, we find that as $T \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\sigma(y)\big(\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\big)^2\mathrm{d}y \\ &\quad\to \gamma\int_0^1 p_s(x)\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(y)\Lambda^2(1-s)\mathrm{d}y, \end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

for all $x \in R$. Applying (4.44)-(4.46) to (4.41) we immediately obtain (4.42). Moreover, using (4.41) again, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_T(x)\mathrm{d}x = &\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}x\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\mathrm{d}y \\ &-T^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}x\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\psi(y,s)\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\mathrm{d}y \\ &-\gamma\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}x\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}} p_s(x - T^{-1/2}y)\sigma(y)\big(\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\big)^2\mathrm{d}y \\ =&\sum_{k=1}^n t_k\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y - T^{-1/2}\int_0^1\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\psi(y,s)\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\mathrm{d}y \\ &-\gamma\int_0^1\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(y)\big(\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\big)^2\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

By (4.7), it is easy to see that

$$T^{-1/2}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\psi(y,s)\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\mathrm{d}y\to 0, \tag{4.48}$$

as $T\to\infty$. Furthermore, combining Lemma 4.5, (4.7) and the dominated convergence theorem yields that

$$\gamma\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(y)\big(\bar{H}_T(y,1-s)\big)^2\mathrm{d}y\to\gamma\int_0^1\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(y)\Lambda^2(1-s)\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.49}$$

Combining (4.47) with (4.48) and (4.49), we have (4.43). □

Now we are at the place to give the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 For any given non-negative $\phi_1,\phi_2,\cdots,\phi_n\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and $0\le t_1<t_2<\cdots<t_n\le 1$, by using (4.1), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\langle X(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\Big\}\Big)&=\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\xi(t_k)\Big\}\Big)\\&=\exp\Big\{K\int_{1-t_n}^1\Lambda^2(s)\mathrm{d}s-\sum_{k=1}^n t_k\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

where $\Lambda(s)$ is exactly the unique nonnegative solution of the equation (4.36). On the other hand, from Lemma 3.2 and (4.39), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\langle X_T(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\Big\}\Big)=\exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}}H_T(x)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}. \tag{4.51}$$

Applying Lemma 4.7 and Remark 4.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{T\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\sum_{k=1}^n\langle X_T(t_k),\phi_k\rangle\Big\}\Big)\\&\quad=\exp\Big\{K\int_{1-t_n}^1\Lambda^2(s)\mathrm{d}s-\sum_{k=1}^n t_k\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

(4.50) and (4.52) imply that $X=\lambda\xi$ is the limit of X_T in the sense of convergence of finite-dimensional distributions. The non-negativity of ξ follows from the fact that X_T is a non-negative measure for every $T>0$. □

Below we give the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2 To prove the weak convergence of $\{X_T\}_{T\ge1}$ in $C([0,1],\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$, it suffices to prove the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions plus the tightness of $\{X_T\}_{T\ge1}$ in $C([0,1],\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$. The former is proved by Theorem 4.1. To prove the latter, let $Y_T(t)=X_T(t)-t\lambda$. The tightness of X_T in $C([0,1],\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$ is same as that of Y_T in $C([0,1],\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}))$. Therefore, by using the theorem of Mitoma [14], it suffices to prove that $\{\langle Y_T,\phi\rangle\}_{T\ge1}$ is tight in $C([0,1],\mathbb{R})$ for any given $\phi\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Thus, by the same arguments as those used in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Li [11], we can readily get the desired conclusion. The details are omitted. □

5. Properties of the solutions of integral equations

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.3.

Proof. **(1)**. Let $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ be the unique nonnegative solution of the equation (2.6) for $s\in[0,1]$. Therefore, $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ is continuous and differentiable. Furthermore, from the proof of Theorem 4.1, we see that $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ is the limit of

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{H}_T(x,s)&=T^{1/2}V_{\psi_T}(x,Ts,T(1-s))\\&=T^{1/2}\Big[1-\mathbb{E}_x\Big(\exp\big\{-\int_0^{Ts}\big\langle N(u),\psi_T(\cdot,T(1-s)+u)\big\rangle\mathrm{d}u\big\}\Big)\Big]\\&=T^{1/2}\Big[1-\mathbb{E}_x\Big(\exp\big\{-\int_0^{s}\big\langle N(Tu),\phi(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(1-s+u)\big\rangle\mathrm{d}u\big\}\Big)\Big]\\&=T^{1/2}\Big[1-\mathbb{E}_x\Big(\exp\big\{-\int_0^{s}\big\langle N(Tu),\phi(x)\big\rangle\mathrm{d}u\big\}\Big)\Big],\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi\geq 0$ satisfies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(x)\mathrm{d}x=\theta$. It is easy to see that $\bar{H}_T(x,s)$ is non-decreasing on s. Therefore $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ is non-decreasing as well. Differentiating both sides of (2.6) on s leads to that for any $s\in(0,1)$

$$\Lambda'(s,\theta)=\sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi s}}\theta-2K\int_0^s\frac{\Lambda(s-u,\theta)\Lambda'(s-u,\theta)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\geq 0, \tag{5.1}$$

which further implies that

$$\sqrt{2\pi s}\Lambda'(s,\theta)=\theta-2K\sqrt{s}\int_0^s\frac{\Lambda(s-u,\theta)\Lambda'(s-u,\theta)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{u}}\leq\theta-K\Lambda^2(s,\theta). \tag{5.2}$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\Lambda(s,\theta)\leq\sqrt{\theta/K}.$$

(2). Now, we observe the following nonlinear integral equation.

$$h(s)=\sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}-K\int_0^s\frac{h^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}},\qquad s\geq 0. \tag{5.3}$$

We can readily verify that for any $m>0$,

$$h(s):=\Lambda(s/\theta,\theta)/\sqrt{\theta}\leq 1/\sqrt{K} \tag{5.4}$$

is a non-negative and bounded solution of (5.3) on $[0,m]$ for a given $\theta\geq m$. On the contrary, if $h(s)$ is a solution of (5.3) on $[0,m]$, then for any $\theta\leq m$,

$$\Lambda(s,\theta)=\sqrt{\theta}h(\theta s),\qquad s\in[0,1], \tag{5.5}$$

is a non-negative and bounded solution of (2.6) for $s\in[0,1]$. Due to the uniqueness of non-negative and bounded solutions of (2.6) for $s\in[0,1]$, we know (5.3) has an unique non-negative and bounded solution on $[0,m]$ for any $m>0$, and hence on $[0,\infty)$. For

convenience, we denote the unique solution by $h(s)$. Thanks to the monotonicity of $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ on $s\in[0,1]$ and the definition of (5.4), we can readily see that $h(s)$ is non-decreasing in $[0.m]$ for any $m>0$. Therefore, $h(s)$ is non-decreasing on $[0,\infty)$.

Based on the aforementioned facts, we can extend $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ to the positive half-line by (5.5) and denote the extension by $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ as well. Obviously, $h(s)=\Lambda(s,1)$. It is easy to check that $\Lambda(s,\theta)$ is the unique non-decreasing non-negative solution of (2.6) for all $s\geq 0$. Furthermore by using (5.4) we obtain that for any $s>0$ and $\theta>0$

$$\Lambda(s,\theta)=\sqrt{\theta}h(\theta s)=\frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\sqrt{\theta s}}\Lambda(\frac{\theta s}{\theta s},\theta s)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\Lambda(1,\theta s).$$

Therefore, the desired conclusion (2.7) holds. Let

$$l=\lim_{s\to\infty}h(s)=\lim_{s\to\infty}\Lambda(s,1).$$

Then from (5.3) we derive that

$$l\geq\sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}-Kl^2\int_0^s\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}=\sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}(1-Kl^2),$$

for any $s>0$. Letting $s\to\infty$ leads to

$$Kl^2\geq 1. \tag{5.6}$$

On the other hand, from Theorem 2.2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}1\geq\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta\xi(1)})&=\exp\left\{K\int_0^1\Lambda^2(s,\theta)\mathrm{d}s-\theta\right\}=\exp\left\{\theta\Big(K\int_0^1\Lambda^2(\theta s,1)\mathrm{d}s-1\Big)\right\}\\&=\exp\left\{\theta\Big(K\int_0^\theta\Lambda^2(s,1)\mathrm{d}s/\theta-1\Big)\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

which indicates that

$$\lim_{\theta\to\infty}K\int_0^\theta\Lambda^2(s,1)\mathrm{d}s/\theta-1=Kl^2-1\leq 0.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\lim_{s\to\infty}\Lambda(s,1)=l=1/\sqrt{K}. \tag{5.8}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is complete. □

6. Properties of the limiting process ξ

By the same discussion as those in the proof of Talarczyk [16, Theorem 2.4], we can readily get from Theorem 2.2 that the process ξ is infinitely divisible, self-similar with index 1, non-decreasing and nonnegative, and has continuous paths, i.e., Proposition 2.1 is right. Below, we prove Proposition 2.2.

Proof. Recall that $\xi(1)$ is non-negative and infinitely divisible. From [18, P.385], we know that there exist a non-negative constant γ_0 and a measure ν on $(0,\infty)$ with $\int_0^\infty (1\wedge x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)<\infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta\xi(1)}) = \exp\Big\{ -\theta\Big(\gamma_0 + \int_0^\infty \frac{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}}{\theta}\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big)\Big\}, \tag{6.1}$$

which and (5.7) lead to

$$K\int_0^\theta \Lambda^2(s,1)\mathrm{d}s/\theta - 1 = -\gamma_0 - \int_0^\infty \frac{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}}{\theta}\nu(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{6.2}$$

Note that $\int_0^\infty \frac{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}}{\theta}\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\to 0$ as $\theta\to\infty$. From (5.8) and (6.2) we obtain that

$$\gamma_0 = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Substituting (6.3) into (6.1) yields

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta\xi(1)}) = \exp\Big\{ -\int_0^\infty (1-\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x})\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big\}.$$

Therefore, (2.8) follows from the fact $\xi(t)\overset{d}{=} t\xi(1)$.

Now, substituting (6.3) into (6.2), we get that

$$K\int_0^\theta \Lambda^2(s,1)\mathrm{d}s = \theta - \int_0^\infty (1-\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x})\nu(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{6.4}$$

Differentiating both sides of (6.4) leads to

$$K\Lambda^2(\theta,1) = 1 - \int_0^\infty x\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}\nu(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{6.5}$$

for any $\theta>0$. Combining (2.7) with (6.5) indicates (2.9).

In addition, substituting (6.5) into (5.3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(t,1) &= \int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sqrt{2\pi(t-\theta)}}\Big(\int_0^\infty x\mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big) = \int_0^\infty \Big[x\mathrm{e}^{-tx}\int_0^t \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\theta x}}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}}\mathrm{d}\theta\Big]\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}Q(tx)\nu(\mathrm{d}x),\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where for any $w>0$,

$$Q(w) = \frac{\sqrt{w}}{\mathrm{e}^w}\int_0^w \frac{\mathrm{e}^y}{\sqrt{y}}\mathrm{d}y.$$

Therefore, combining (2.7) and (6.6) leads to (2.10).

Furthermore, it is easy to see that $Q(w)$ is continuous on $(0,\infty)$ with $\lim_{w\to 0}Q(w)=0$, and by the L'Hôpital's law,

$$\lim_{w\to\infty} Q(w) = 1.$$

Therefore, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $Q(w) \leq M$ for all $w > 0$. Applying this fact to (6.6), we get that

$$\sqrt{2\pi t}\Lambda(t,1) \leq M \int_0^\infty \nu(\mathrm{d}x), \tag{6.7}$$

for all $t > 0$. Then letting $t \to \infty$ implies that

$$\nu((0,\infty)) = \int_0^\infty \nu(\mathrm{d}s) = \infty. \tag{6.8}$$

In addition, from the equation (2.6), it is easy to see that $\Lambda(0,1) = 0$. Letting $\theta \to 0$, (6.5) implies that

$$1 = \int_0^\infty x\nu(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{6.9}$$

Moreover, (5.3) implies that $h(s) := \Lambda(s,1)$ is differentiable, and for all $s > 0$

$$h'(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} - K\int_0^s \frac{2h(s-u)h'(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u. \tag{6.10}$$

Applying (6.10) to (5.3) yields that for all $s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} h(s)h'(s) = &\frac{1}{\pi} - K\sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}\int_0^s \frac{2h(s-u)h'(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u - \frac{K}{\sqrt{2\pi s}}\int_0^s \frac{h^2(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u \\ &+K^2\int_0^s \frac{2h(s-u)h'(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u\int_0^s \frac{h^2(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by the L'hôpital Law,

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s}}\int_0^s \frac{h^2(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u = \lim_{s\to 0}\sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}\int_0^s \frac{2h(s-u)h'(s-u)}{\sqrt{2\pi u}}\mathrm{d}u = 0.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\lim_{s\to 0} h(s)h'(s) = \frac{1}{\pi}. \tag{6.11}$$

Now, we differentiate both sides of (6.5) and get that

$$2Kh(\theta)h'(\theta) = \int_0^\infty x^2 \mathrm{e}^{-\theta x}\nu(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Letting $\theta \to 0$ and using (6.11), we obtain that

$$\int_0^\infty x^2\nu(\mathrm{d}x) = 2K/\pi,$$

which and (6.8), and (6.9) complete the proof of Proposition 2.2. □

At last, we devote to proving that X_T converges in finite-dimensional distributions to the 0-measure under the condition of $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x = \infty$. This is equivalent to proving

that $X_T(1)$ converges in distributions as $T \to \infty$ to the measure concentrated on the 0-measure.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $B_n = \{|x| \le n\}$ and $\sigma_n(x) = \sigma(x)\mathbf{1}_{B_n}(x)$. Then

$$K_n := \gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma_n(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty.$$

For any non-negative $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, Let $v_n(x,t) \in [0,1]$ be the solution of

$$\frac{\partial v(x,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v(x,t) - \gamma\sigma_n(x)v^2(x,t) + \frac{1}{T}\phi(x)\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(1-\frac{t}{T})\big(1-v(x,t)\big),$$

with $v(x,0) = 0$, and $v(x,t) \in [0,1]$ be also the solution of this equation but σ_n replaced by σ. Since $0 \le \sigma_n \le \sigma$, by the maximum principle, we have that

$$0 \le v(x,t) \le v_n(x,t) \le 1.$$

Therefore, from Remark 3.1, it follows that for any $n \ge 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\langle X_T(1),\phi\rangle\Big\}\Big) \ge \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}} v_n(x,T)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}. \tag{6.12}$$

Reviewing the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}} v_n(x,T)\mathrm{d}x\Big\} = \exp\Big\{K_n\int_0^1 \Lambda_n^2(s)\mathrm{d}s - \|\phi\|_1\Big\}, \tag{6.13}$$

where the function $\Lambda_n(s)$ is the unique non-negative solution of the equation

$$\Lambda(s) = \sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}\|\phi\|_1 - K_n\int_0^s \frac{\Lambda^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}, \tag{6.14}$$

and $\|\phi\|_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(y)\mathrm{d}y$. Let $\bar{\Lambda}_n(s) = K_n\Lambda_n(s)$. Then (6.14) implies that $\bar{\Lambda}_n(s)$ is the unique non-negative solution of the equation

$$\Lambda(s) = \sqrt{\frac{2s}{\pi}}K_n\|\phi\|_1 - \int_0^s \frac{\Lambda^2(u)\mathrm{d}u}{\sqrt{2\pi(s-u)}}. \tag{6.15}$$

Observing the equation (2.6), we get that

$$\bar{\Lambda}_n(s) = \Lambda_1(s, K_n\|\phi\|_1),$$

where $\Lambda_1(s,\theta)$ is the unique non-negative solution of (2.6) with $K = 1$. Then by same argument used in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we can readily get that

$$\begin{aligned} K_n\int_0^1 \Lambda_n^2(s)\mathrm{d}s &= \frac{1}{K_n}\int_0^1 \bar{\Lambda}_n^2(s)\mathrm{d}s \\ &= \frac{1}{K_n}\int_0^1 \Lambda_1^2(s, K_n\|\phi\|_1)\mathrm{d}s = \frac{1}{K_n}\int_0^{K_n\|\phi\|_1} \Lambda_1^2(s,1)\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

By (5.8),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty}\Lambda_1(s,1)=1. \tag{6.17}$$

The assumption $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma(x)\mathrm{d}x=\infty$ implies that $K_n\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$. From (6.16) and (6.17), it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}K_n\int_0^1\Lambda_n^2(s)\mathrm{d}s=\|\phi\|_1. \tag{6.18}$$

Combining (6.12) with (6.13) and letting $n\to\infty$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{T\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\Big(\exp\Big\{-\langle X_T(1),\phi\rangle\Big\}\Big)&\geq\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{T\to\infty}\exp\Big\{-\int_{\mathbb{R}}v_n(x,T)\mathrm{d}x\Big\}\\&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\exp\Big\{K_n\int_0^1\Lambda_n^2(s)\mathrm{d}s-\|\phi\|_1\Big\}=1,\end{aligned}$$

where (6.18) is used at the last equality. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is complete. □

References

[1] Bojdecki, T., Gorostiza, L. and Talarczyk, A. Limit theorem for occupation time fluctuations of branching systems I: Long-range dependence. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 116 (2006): 1-18.

[2] Bojdecki, T., Gorostiza, L. and Talarczyk, A. A long range dependence stable process and an infinite variance branching system. *Ann. Probab.*, 35 (2007): 500-527.

[3] Cox, J. T. and Griffeath, D. Occupation time limit theorems for the voter model. *Ann. Probab.* 11 (1983):876-893.

[4] Cox, J.T. and Griffeath, D. Occupation times for critical branching Brownian motions. *Ann. Probab.* 13 (1985): 1108-1132.

[5] Dawson, D. A., Gorostiza, L. G. and Wakolbinger, A. Occupation time fluctuation in branching systems. *J. Theoret. probab.*, 14 (2001): 729-796.

[6] Dynkin, E. B. Branching particle systems and superprocesses. *Ann. Probab.*, 3 (1991): 1157-1194.

[7] Iscoe, I. A weihted occupation time for a class of measure-valued branching processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 71 (1986): 85-116.

[8] Iscoe, I. Ergodic theory and a local occupation time for measure-valued critical branching Brownian motion. *Stochastics*, **18** (1986): 197-243.

[9] Li, Y. Occupation time fluctuations of strongly degenerate branching systems. Sci. China Math., (In press). Available at http://faculty.ecnu.edu.cn/liyuqiang

[10] Li, Y. Fluctuation limits of site-dependent Branching systems in critical and large dimensions. *Stat. Prob. Lett.*, DOI: 10.1016/j.spl.2011.05.015

[11] Li, Y. Convergence to Riemann-Liouville processes from Branching Systems. (Preprint) Available at http://faculty.ecnu.edu.cn/liyuqiang

[12] Li, Y. and Xiao, Y. Occupation time fluctuations of weakly degenerate branching systems. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, DOI: 10.1007/s10959-011-0358-3

[13] Miłoś, P. Occupation time fluctuations of Poisson and equilibrium finite variance branching systems. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 27(2007): 181-203.

[14] Mitoma, I. Tightness of probability on $C([0,1];\mathscr{S}')$ and $D([0,1];\mathscr{S}')$. *Ann. Probab.* **11** (1983), 989-999.

[15] Pinsky, R. Invariant probability distributions for measure-valued diffusions. *Ann. Probab.* **29** (2001): 1476-1514.

[16] Talarczyk, A. A functional ergodic theorem for the occupation time process of a branching system. *Stat. Probab. Lett.*, 78 (2008): 847-853.

[17] Sawyer, S. and Fleischman, J. Maximum geographic range of a mutant allele considered as a subtype of a Brownian branching random field. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 76 (1979): 872-875.

[18] Sato, K. *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.